

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

2. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Paul A. Pysher (Reg. No.: 40,780) on 12/04/09. The application has been amended as follows:

Please amend:

21. ([Previously Presented] New) The machine-readable medium of claim 17, wherein the intermediary protocol is a same protocol as the local protocols.

22. ([Previously Presented] New) The machine-readable medium of claim 17, further comprising instructions to:

create a socket interface to at least one of the client application and the server application, data from the at least one machine being transmitted through the socket interface.

23. ([Previously Presented] New) The machine-readable medium of claim 17, wherein the client application and the server application are on networks that run the local protocols, and wherein conversion between the local protocols and the intermediary protocol occurs prior to passing the data through the at least one machine.

24. ([Previously Presented] New) The machine-readable medium of claim 23, wherein the local protocols comprise at least one of TCP/IP and a serial protocol, the serial protocol comprising one of RS232 and RS485.

25. ([Previously Presented] New) The machine-readable medium of claim 17, wherein the identifier is associated with the at least one queue.

26. ([Previously Presented] New) The machine-readable medium of claim 17, wherein the at least one machine comprises a server, and the machine-readable medium further comprises instructions to:
perform load balancing to select the server.

3. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: None of the prior art references teach (alone or in combination) all the limitations together, within the independent claims 1, 12 and 17. For example, the independent claims

contain limitations, receiving, from the client application, a command to obtain data in the at least one queue that is destined for the client application and that is present at a time the command from the client application is received, and receiving, from the server application, a command to obtain data in the at least one queue that is destined for the server application and that is present at a time the command from the server application is received, the command received from the client application being an HTTP command to retrieve data from the at least one device, and the command received from the server application being an HTTP command to retrieve data from the at least one device; and the client application and the server application run local protocols, and the data is passed between the client application and the server application via an intermediary protocol; and the client application is behind a first firewall, the server application is behind a second firewall, and the at least one device is not behind either the first firewall or the second firewall. Applicants' arguments [filed 8/19/09, pages 10-14] are considered persuasive to the limitations of these claims over the prior art of record. Examiner agrees that the limitations of the independent claims are allowable subject matter over the prior art, in light of the specification, with receiving, from the client application, a command to obtain data in the at least one queue that is destined for the client application and that is present at a time the command from the client application is received, and receiving, from the server application, a command to obtain data in the at least one queue that is destined for the server application and that is present at a time the command

from the server application is received, the command received from the client application being an HTTP command to retrieve data from the at least one device, and the command received from the server application being an HTTP command to retrieve data from the at least one device; and the client application and the server application run local protocols, and the data is passed between the client application and the server application via an intermediary protocol; and the client application is behind a first firewall, the server application is behind a second firewall, and the at least one device is not behind either the first firewall or the second firewall [Specification, paragraphs 18-51]. Most prior art teaches a network system comprises a proxy receives a request for a web page from a client application, which would be received later from a server application, and thereafter send back to the client application. Thus, the proxy does not return the web page which is present at a time the request from the client application is received, because the proxy has to wait for the server application response first then sent the web page back to the client application later. Moreover, the system does not require the client application and the server behind a different firewall (in other word, it does not require the client behind first firewall, and the server behind a second firewall). Therefore, the combination of the limitations, within its environment, is allowable subject matter, in light of the specification and in view of the Applicants' persuasive arguments. The independent claims 1, 12 and 17 (and their dependent claims) are allowable, since the claim language discloses

this combination of limitations in accordance with the specification, over the prior art of record.

4. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."
5. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14, 16-26 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH-CHAU NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-4242. The examiner can normally be reached on 7AM-3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, VIVEK SRIVASTAVA can be reached on (571) 272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrice Winder/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/M. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2445